



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,292	09/27/2001	Bret S. Weber	01-221	3852
7590	06/21/2006		EXAMINER	
LSI Logic Corporation Corporate Legal Department Intellectual Property Services Group 1551 McCarthy Boulevard, M/S D-106 Milpitas, CA 95035			MEUCCI, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	
DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

***Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

Application No.

09/965,292

Applicant(s)

WEBER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Meucci

Art Unit

2142

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1 and 10, the applicant argues that Reshef does not teach: pre-posting command buffers to an InfiniBand isolation bridge, wherein the buffers contain external small computer system interface commands and translating the command from an InfiniBand host system command to a command for the device with an internal InfiniBand bus structure to form a translated command, and sending the translated command to the device within an internal InfiniBand bus structure. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner points out that Pettey, not Reshef was relied upon to teach the Infiniband isolation bridge with proper motivation. Reshef clearly teaches pre-posting command buffers on lines 19-45 which describes buffering incoming commands (lines 26-28 of column 16), the commands being in application format (i.e. external small computer system interface commands) (lines 19-24 of column 16), translating the command (lines 10-15 of column 13), and sends the translated command to the device (lines 17-18 of column 13 and lines 42-52 of column 13). These cited sections clearly teach all the limitations in question.

Still regarding claims 1 and 10, the applicant argues that Pettey does not teach an InfiniBand isolation bridge. While not specifically called an InfiniBand isolation bridge, the function of the InfiniBand isolation bridge of the instant application is clearly taught by the obvious addition of Pettey. The examiner points to lines 29-38 of column 3 in Pettey which describes InfiniBand RDMA data received from a remote InfiniBand node. This clearly teaches that the host system is an Infiniband system. The isolation bridge limitations are taught by Reshef above. As such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the examiner.

The applicant's arguments pertaining to claims 5 and 14 are similar in nature to those discussed above with regards to claims 1 and 10. The applicant's remaining arguments are directed towards subject matter disclosed in claims 1, 5, 10, and 14. No further arguments have been made.

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER